

my colleague, I believe that the comments made by so many are so accurate on the question of what we are doing in this House and the importance of taking care of the people that we have come to be responsible for.

It is really a question of what are the challenges of this body and who do we owe our allegiances and responsibilities to in terms of the American people. Frankly, I believe that all of the American people look to this body to be fair and equitable, and it is interesting that we take the time to allegedly address concerns that we believe that they are interested in, but leave a lot on the table while much goes longingly for our attention.

I would ask this body to look at the conditions that we are in in 2003 and compare them to conditions over the last almost 15 years or so, from 1989 to 2002. Under President Bush, Sr., we see unemployment skyrocketing above 8 percent. Under President William Jefferson Clinton, in an 8-year term, we can see that the unemployment of this Nation, impacting everyone, went down to a bare minimum of under 4 percent. It means that the economic policies that were generated the last 8 years created jobs.

I am reminded of a very strategic vote in 1993 when we were peaking in unemployment, and lo and behold, there was a very vital, strategic decision by the Democratic Caucus and President Clinton to make a decided vote on behalf of the American people, a budget vote that saw the economy skyrocket to success and unemployment go down. Now we find ourselves in a predicament, skyrocketing deficit, a budget that does not seem to be able to be complied with and unemployment shooting through the roof.

With that backdrop, Mr. Speaker, what did we do before the Memorial Day holiday? No, we did not invest in human resources, hospitals and clinics, health insurance for all Americans. We did not invest in infrastructure, building highways, freeways, roads, enabling our railroads, enabling our various modes of transportation, providing greater access for the working community of America. We did not create jobs by investing in homeland security, even in the backdrop of a Red Alert.

What we did was compress a \$550 billion tax cut, which by the way, Mr. Speaker, I believe will ultimately result in a \$1.6 trillion tax cut which makes the deficit soar deeper and deeper downward. No. We decided to pass a \$350 billion tax cut. That was in name only because, as I said, I believe it is really \$550 billion and ultimately \$1.6 trillion, in light of skyrocketing unemployment.

We have argued, of course, that this will generate into some mode of opportunities for all Americans, but let me share with my colleagues the word of Warren Buffett on that tax cut, as he pointed out that the tax cut by the administration, the Bush administration, suggesting that it would create jobs,

remember I mentioned to my colleagues that we have got a skyrocketing unemployment rate, Mr. Buffett, who is the richest or second richest in the Nation, he says that the administration's tax plan was like a manager saying we are going to grow our earnings 20 percent a year. They do not have the faintest idea, in my view, of how many jobs this is going to create. How could they? Economics is not precise.

So when Democrats had a tax plan that directly invested in infrastructure, health care and homeland security, we knew what kind of jobs we would create. We have got a pie-in-the-sky plan. So what do we do, Mr. Speaker? We come together. Democrats stand on the floor of the House into the wee hours of the morning on Friday preceding the Memorial Day holiday, begging for reality, begging for sense to be made and saying that the least of those have been left out.

Of course, we were demagogued, castigated and suggested that this was not the time. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues who we have left out, as I mention to my colleagues these numbers very quickly: 11.9 million children, 6.5 million working couples who qualify for the earned income tax and 8.1 million taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass the Rangel-DeLauro-Davis bill that provides a minimal child tax credit for these left out souls, and we should take away this tax bill that does nothing for a great number of Americans who work every day for us.

INJUSTICES OF THE TAX BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak again about the injustice of President Bush's latest tax cut bill. It is really amazing what he has done to families with children earning between \$10,000 and \$26,625. They are not treated like American families who earn larger sums than that.

I want to quote from the editorial today in the Bangor Daily News in my State of Maine. The editorial reads, "On the day President Bush signed his latest tax cut bill, astute observers noticed that the increase from \$600 to \$1,000 in the package's child tax credit would not apply to children of the working poor. Families with incomes under \$26,625 will remain at \$600. By leaving those children at the lower level, did the tax cut crafters really mean to imply they were worth only three-fifths of richer kids? Did someone have an awful sense of symbolism or are they trying to tell the public something?"

Three-fifths. If families earned between \$10,000 and \$26,600 a year, they get three-fifths of the tax cut, the child tax credit earned by people earning over \$26,000 a year.

Now, just coincidentally perhaps, that is the way slaves were counted in the Constitution. When the Constitution was written, slaves were to be counted as three-fifths of a person, and today, under the Bush tax cut, children and families earning between \$10,000 and \$26,000 a year count for three-fifths of what children and families earning over \$26,000 a year.

It is an embarrassment. It is shameful. It is yet one more example, if any were needed, that this administration is on a relentless quest to treat the very wealthy in this country differently, in fact, to transfer as much money as they can from middle-income America to the richest people in the country.

It would have been easy to correct this problem, very, very easy. Let me give my colleagues one example.

The cost of the deleted low-income child tax provision is \$3.5 billion. It is 1 percent of the official cost of \$350 billion for the final bill, and it could have been easily made up by reducing the top income rate by 0.1 percent for 3 years, because for each 0.1 percentage rate that the top rate is reduced, the cost is \$1.3 billion. That is all it would take, 0.1 percent less to the top rate. This is all it would have taken, and people with incomes over \$1 million a year on average would get, instead of a tax cut of \$93,500 a year, they would get an average tax cut of \$88,000.

In other words, for a reduction in their tax cut of \$5,500, we could have reached 12 million children. We could have reached all of those children in families between \$10,000 and \$26,000 and given them just the same tax cut that go to families earning more.

□ 1945

It is unbelievable, it is appalling that once again the administration has taken this approach.

I would just say that it is obvious from this example and others that this is not a tax cut designed to increase economic growth. Its primary purpose, given the huge deficits, given the fact that every dollar of the tax cut is borrowed, borrowed from our children and grandchildren, it is obvious once again the whole motive here is to drain the Federal Government of revenues so that we will not have the funds to fund education the way we have in the past, so that we will cut veterans benefits, as reflected in the President's budget, and so there will not be sufficient funds to maintain Social Security and Medicare in the way in which they have been funded in the past.

This administration and the Republicans in Congress are engaged in a determined effort to reduce the size of the Federal Government at the same time that they are increasing the wealth of the wealthiest people in this country. It is embarrassing, it is shameful, it should stop.

TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under